

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/520,470	01/07/2005	Thomas Tuschl	2923-673	5503		
6449 ROTHWELL	7590 10/24/200 FIGG, ERNST & MAN	EXAM	EXAMINER			
1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			SHIN, I	SHIN, DANA H		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	. ,	1635				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			10/24/2008	FLECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/520,470	TUSCHL ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	DANA SHIN	1635		

	DANA SHIN	1635						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 07 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	THE REPLY FILED 07 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of otermining the period of exh under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the filed with th	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	,							
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a) They raise new issues that would require further cor b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belov	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	ter form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying tl	ne issues for					
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		•	•					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [be entered and an e	xplanation of					
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	ided below or appended.							
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 1.3-9.11-20.32-36 and 38-41. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 22-31.								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
13. Other:	- · · · · ·							

/J. E. Angell/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1635 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the combination of Tijsterman et al., Elabashir et al., and McSwiggen does not render the claimed invention obvious because "it would have been HOPELESS (emphasis added) to use short single-stranded RNA molecules for RNAi in mammalian systems" at the time of the invention, in so arguing, applicant contends that the differences in biology between C. elegans and mammalian cell systems would have prevented one skilled in the art to arrive at the invention by providing syniality reasoning previously presented in the reply fied on 10-29-2007 and 3-10-2008. Hence, the claims remain rejected as being obvious for the same reasons stated in the previous Office actions dated 12-11-2007 and 4-1-2008. Further, applicant appears to rely on the declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.132. However, the declaration is not considered on merits because applicant has not provided good and sufficient reasons as to why the declaration was not presented earlier, especially given the fact that the same combination of prior art references and same grows of 10/3(a) rejection were previously applied for claims 1, 3-9, 11-20, 32-36, and 38-41. See the Office action dated December 11, 2007. Accordingly, the 103(a) rejection refrection termains maintained.